

access to services as medicare beneficiaries in other hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. DOLE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. KYL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. BURNS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 833. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FAIRCLOTH (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELMS, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 834. A bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, and reduce welfare dependence; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 835. A bill to provide for the operation of laboratories to carry out certain public-health functions for the region along the international border with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. EXON:

S. 836. A bill to authorize appropriations for pipeline safety for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ROBB):

S. 837. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of James Madison; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 831. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the tax treatment of certain contributions made pursuant to veterans' reemployment; to the Committee on Finance.

THE VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS ACT OF 1995

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am today introducing, with the cosponsorship of my good friend from Wyoming, AL SIMPSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, legislation that involves a matter related to the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 [USERRA], Public Law 103-353. This landmark rewrite of a 1940's law, which provides employment protections to returning servicemembers, was derived from legislation reported by the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees. There was one issue, however, related to USERRA which falls under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, a committee on which AL SIMPSON and I also serve. It was not possible to get this issue resolved last year before final passage of the USERRA legislation, and the bill we are introducing today would accomplish that goal.

Mr. President, the matter in question relates to provisions in USERRA which address a returning servicemember's

rights to participate in the employer's pension plan and, more specifically, to the relationship between USERRA and the Internal Revenue Code. Under USERRA, it is possible that a pension plan, by seeking to comply with USERRA, could have to make payments on behalf of now returned servicemembers that could cause the plan to go out of compliance with the Internal Revenue Code [IRC] because of the total amount of payments made by the plan in a given year. Obviously, this is a result that is not intended and which should be avoided. The appropriate remedy—an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code—is in the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, and thus the matter must be resolved in legislation developed by that committee.

Mr. President, so as to allow time for an amendment to the IRC to be considered, USERRA provides a 2-year period before compliance with the pension provisions in the new law would be required. As I noted during Senate debate last September on the final compromise of the USERRA legislation, it was my intention, which I communicated at the time to Senator MOYNIHAN in his then-role as chairman of the Finance Committee, to take the lead in the Finance Committee in proposing the appropriate amendment to the Internal Revenue Code as part of the first appropriate tax bill. I also indicated to Senator MOYNIHAN that, should such an amendment not be in law as the 2-year window provided in USERRA nears its end, I would work to amend USERRA so as to provide for a further delay in the effective date of the pension provisions.

Mr. President, our introduction of this bill today is the initial step in seeking to fulfill the pledges made last fall. I look forward to working with Senator SIMPSON and all the members of the Finance Committee on this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill we are introducing be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### S. 831

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS MADE PURSUANT TO VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(u) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS.—

“(1) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN REQUIRED CONTRIBUTIONS.—If any contribution is made by an employer under an individual account plan with respect to an employee and such contribution is required by reason of such employee's rights under chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, resulting from qualified military service—

“(A) such contribution shall not be subject to any otherwise applicable limitation contained in section 402(g), 403(b), 404(a), 408, 415, or 457, and

“(B) such plan shall not be treated as failing to meet any requirement of this part or section 457 by reason of the making of such contribution and such contribution shall not be taken into account in applying the limitations referred to in subparagraph (A) to other contributions.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, any additional elective deferral made under paragraph (2) shall be treated as an employer contribution required by reason of the employee's rights under such chapter 43.

“(2) REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS WITH RESPECT TO ELECTIVE DEFERRALS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If an employee is entitled to the benefits of chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to any plan which provides for elective deferrals, such employer shall be treated as meeting the requirements of such chapter 43 with respect to such elective deferrals if such employer—

“(i) permits such employee to make additional elective deferrals under such plan (in the amount determined under subparagraph (B)) during the period which begins on the date of the reemployment and whose duration is the lesser of—

“(I) 5 years; or

“(II) 3 times the period of qualified military service which resulted in such rights; and

“(ii) makes a matching contribution in respect of any additional elective deferral made pursuant to clause (i) which would have been required had such deferral actually been made during the period of such qualified military service.

“(B) AMOUNT OF MAKEUP REQUIRED.—The amount determined under this subparagraph is the maximum amount of elective deferrals that the individual would have been permitted to make under the plan during his period of qualified military service if he had continued to be employed by the employer during such period and received compensation at the rate computed in accordance with section 4318(b)(3) of title 38. Proper adjustment shall be made to the amount determined under the preceding sentence for any elective deferrals actually made during the period of such qualified military service.

“(C) ELECTIVE DEFERRAL.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘elective deferral’ has the meaning given to such term by section 402(g)(3); except that such term shall include any deferral of compensation under an eligible deferred compensation plan (as defined in section 457(b)).

“(3) LOAN REPAYMENT SUSPENSIONS PERMITTED.—If any plan suspends the repayment of any loan made to an individual for the period while such individual is performing qualified military service, such suspension shall not be taken into account for purposes of section 72(p).

“(4) QUALIFIED MILITARY SERVICE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified military service’ means any service in the uniformed services (as defined in chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code) by any individual if such individual is entitled to reemployment rights under such chapter 43, with respect to such service.

“(5) INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNT PLAN.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘individual account plan’ means any defined contribution plan and any eligible deferred compensation plan (as defined in section 457(b)).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as of September 2, 1974, and shall apply to plans as if such amendment were enacted on such date as part of section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.●

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 832. A bill to require the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission to develop separate applicable percentage increases to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries who receive services from Medicare-dependent hospitals receive the same quality of care and access to services as Medicare beneficiaries in other hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE MEDICARE DEPENDENT HOSPITAL RELIEF  
ACT OF 1995

• Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I introduce timely legislation that addresses the problems of a special class of institutions—Medicare-dependent hospitals—that have Medicare patient loads of 60 percent or more. These hospitals, both rural and urban, have significantly higher Medicare losses and lower overall margins than other hospitals. This problem, particularly in light of Medicare payment reductions in this year's forthcoming budget reconciliation package, threatens the viability of these hospitals and the access to and quality of services to Medicare beneficiaries.

The legislation I am introducing in conjunction with my good friend, Florida Congressman CLAY SHAW, is called the Medicare Dependent Hospital Relief Act of 1995. The bill would simply require that the Prospective Payment Advisory Commission [ProPAC], in addition to its recommendations on payment rate updates for all hospitals, makes a separate recommendation on updates for Medicare-dependent hospitals. This recommendation would be required to be budget neutral.

In addition, the bill would require ProPAC's annual report to Congress to include recommendations ensuring that beneficiaries served by Medicare-dependent hospitals retain the same access and quality of care as Medicare beneficiaries nationwide.

The need for this legislation is rather simple. In 1992, ProPac estimates that Medicare payments were \$11 billion below the level needed to fully cover the cost of treating Medicare beneficiaries. For the Nation's 1,400 Medicare-dependent hospitals, their high Medicare patient loads limits their ability to cost shift to other payors. In those hospitals with 80 percent Medicare patients, this is particularly difficult—if not impossible.

As the March 1995 ProPAC report notes:

The ability to use cost shifting to fill the revenue gap where Medicare cost increases exceed payment increases varies across hospitals. Facilities that treat larger shares of Medicare, Medicaid and uninsured patients have a lesser ability to cost shift to the private sector. In view of growing price competition in the marketplace, these facilities will face a greater risk of declining margins, which eventually could threaten their financial viability and their ability to care for Medicare beneficiaries.

According to 1992 cost reports, profit margins for hospitals ranged from positive margins as great as 12 percent to losses of 17 percent. Medicare-depend-

ent hospitals, on average, have margins 3 percent below the average Medicare margin. In effect, these hospitals would seem to pay a penalty for their service to the elderly.

In fact, due to low margins, limited ability to cost shift and payments from all payors ratcheting down, Medicare-dependent hospitals will have to either close or reduce services. In either case, the ultimate losers will be the Medicare beneficiaries these hospitals serve.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 832

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Medicare Dependent Hospital Relief Act of 1995".

**SEC. 2. DEVELOPMENT OF SEPARATE APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE INCREASES FOR MEDICARE DEPENDENT HOSPITALS AND OTHER HOSPITALS BY THE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT ASSESSMENT COMMISSION.**

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF SEPARATE APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE INCREASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Prospective Payment Assessment Commission established under section 1886(e)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(e)(2)) (in this section referred to as the "Commission") shall, in accordance with paragraph (2), develop for fiscal year 1997 and each fiscal year thereafter separate applicable percentage increases described in section 1886(b)(3)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(b)(3)(B)) for Medicare dependent hospitals and subsection (d) hospitals which are not Medicare dependent hospitals.

(2) EQUALIZATION OF MEDICARE MARGINS.—The Commission shall develop separate applicable percentage increases under paragraph (1) such that, if such increases were in effect, the estimated average annual Medicare margins of all Medicare dependent hospitals in furnishing inpatient hospital services to Medicare beneficiaries in such fiscal year would be equal to the average annual Medicare margins of all subsection (d) hospitals which are not Medicare dependent hospitals in furnishing inpatient hospital services to Medicare beneficiaries in such fiscal year.

(3) BUDGET NEUTRALITY.—The Commission shall provide that the separate applicable percentage increases developed under paragraph (1) would, if in effect, not result in aggregate payments under section 1886 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww) to Medicare dependent hospitals and subsection (d) hospitals which are not Medicare dependent hospitals for the furnishing of inpatient hospital services in a fiscal year in excess of the aggregate payments under such section to such hospitals in such fiscal year if such increases were not in effect.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in March 1996, the Commission shall, in each of the Commission's March reports to the Congress required under section 1886(e)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(e)(3)), include—

(A) the separate applicable percentage increases developed by the Commission under subsection (a)(1) for the upcoming fiscal year; and

(B) recommendations on methods to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries who receive serv-

ices furnished by Medicare dependent hospitals have the same access and quality of care as Medicare beneficiaries who are furnished services by subsection (d) hospitals which are not Medicare dependent hospitals.

(2) ANNUAL REVIEW OF MEDICARE MARGINS.—The Commission shall develop the recommended methods under paragraph (1)(B) after annually reviewing the average Medicare margins in Medicare dependent hospitals and the impact of such Medicare margins on the Medicare dependent hospitals' overall profit margins.

**SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) MEDICARE BENEFICIARY.—The term "Medicare beneficiary" means an individual who is entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c et seq.).

(2) MEDICARE DEPENDENT HOSPITAL.—The term "Medicare dependent hospital" means any subsection (d) hospital—

(A) that is not classified as a sole community hospital under section 1886(d)(5)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(5)(D)); and

(B) for which not less than 60 percent of its inpatient days were attributable to Medicare beneficiaries during 2 of the last 3 preceding fiscal years for which data is available.

(3) MEDICARE MARGIN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "Medicare margin" means for a fiscal year the ratio expressed as a percentage equal to—

(i) the difference between all Medicare revenues paid to a hospital for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services in a fiscal year and all Medicare program eligible expenses for such operating costs for such fiscal year (as shown by each hospital's HCFA 2552 report submitted annually to the Health Care Financing Administration); divided by

(ii) all Medicare revenues paid to the hospital for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services for such fiscal year.

(B) OPERATING COSTS OF INPATIENT HOSPITAL SERVICES.—The term "operating costs of inpatient hospital services" has the meaning given such term in section 1886(a)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(a)(4)).

(4) SUBSECTION (D) HOSPITAL.—The term "subsection (d) hospital" has the meaning given such term in section 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(1)(B)).

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. DOLE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. KYL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. BURNS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 833. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment; to the Committee on Finance.

THE SEMICONDUCTOR INVESTMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Semiconductor Investment Act of 1995. I am joined by Senators BAUCUS, DOLE, CAMPBELL, FEINSTEIN, COHEN, COCHRAN, KYL, BENNETT, CRAIG, D'AMATO, BURNS, ROCKEFELLER, and BOXER. This bill is designed to help the American semiconductor industry compete globally by shortening the depreciable life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment from 5 years to 3. Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON of Connecticut has introduced identical legislation in the House of Representatives.

The U.S. semiconductor industry employs more than 200,000 Americans, sells over \$40 billion of products annually, and currently controls 40 percent of the world market. Its products form the foundation of practically every electronic device used today. The American semiconductor industry is a success story because it has invested heavily in the most productive, cutting-edge technology available, and currently spends a full 25 percent of its revenues on capital investment. Unfortunately, Mr. President, our semiconductor industry is threatened.

While the equipment used to manufacture semiconductors has a useful life of only about 3 years, current tax depreciation rules require that cost of the equipment be written off over a full 5 years. The Semiconductor Investment Act would correct this flaw, Mr. President, by allowing equipment used in the manufacture of semiconductors to be depreciated over a more appropriate 3-year period. Given the massive level of investment in the semiconductor industry, accurate depreciation is critical to industry success.

The key reason for this 3-year depreciation period is that the equipment used to make semiconductors grows technologically obsolete more quickly than does other manufacturing equipment. Mr. President, recent research indicates that semiconductor manufacturing equipment almost completely loses its ability to produce sellable products after only 3 years. Today's 5-year period simply doesn't reflect reality. A quicker write-off period would help semiconductor manufacturers finance the large investment in equipment they need for the next generation of products.

The National Advisory Committee on Semiconductors reinforced this conclusion. Congress founded the committee in 1988, and it consisted of Presidential appointees from both the public and private sectors. In 1992, the committee recommended a 3-year depreciation period and stated that the shift from a 5-year to a 3-year schedule would increase the industry's annual capital investment rate by a full 11 percent.

By comparison, Japan, Taiwan, and Korea employ much more generous depreciation schedules for similar equipment, and all three nations provide stiff competition for America's semiconductor manufacturers. For example, under Japanese law, a company can depreciate up to 88 percent of its semiconductor equipment cost in the first year, while United States law permits a mere 20-percent depreciation over the same period. When multinational semiconductor firms are deciding where to invest, a depreciation gap this large can be decisive.

This legislation will help ensure that America's semiconductor industry retains its hard-earned preeminence, a preeminence that yields abundant opportunities for high-wage, high-skill employment. Mr. President, my home State of Utah, provides an outstanding

example of the industry's job-creating capacity. Thousands of Utahns earn their living in the State's flourishing semiconductor industry. Firms such as Micron Technology, National Semiconductor, and Varian have reinforced Utah's strong position in high-technology industries. With the fair tax treatment this bill brings, all Utahns can look forward to a more secure and prosperous future.

Mr. President, the Semiconductor Investment Act of 1995 will help level the playing field between U.S. and foreign semiconductor manufacturers, and provides fair tax treatment to an industry that is one of the Nation's greatest success stories of recent years. I hope that my fellow Senators will join me in supporting this legislation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 833

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Semiconductor Investment Act of 1995".

#### SEC. 2. 3-YEAR DEPRECIABLE LIFE FOR SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING EQUIPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 168(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to classification of property) is amended by striking "and" at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting "; and", and by adding at the end the following new clause: "(iii) any semiconductor manufacturing equipment."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (B) of section 168(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking clause (ii) and by redesignating clauses (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi) as clauses (ii), (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively.

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 168(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking the following:

"(B)(ii) ..... 5"

and inserting the following:

"(A)(iii) ..... 3".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to equipment placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. FAIRCLOTH (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELMS, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 834. A bill to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, and reduce welfare dependence; to the Committee on Finance.

#### THE REAL WELFARE REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, before coming to the Senate I spent 45 years in the private sector meeting a payroll as a businessman and a farmer. Every year I watched as the Congress went into session and adjourned, leaving it more difficult for working taxpayers to make ends meet because of

the out-of-control government spending programs that have put our country on the path to a fiscal disaster.

Of all the spending programs implemented by the Federal Government, I do not know of a group that has been a bigger failure than those collectively known as welfare. President Johnson's War on Poverty, although launched with good intentions, has failed. And in many ways it has made the plight of the poor worse instead of better.

The problem is not a lack of spending. Welfare spending has cost taxpayers \$5.3 trillion in constant 1993 dollars since 1965, when the War on Poverty began. Currently, the Federal Government runs approximately 76 means-tested welfare programs, at a cost in 1994 of \$350 billion. And this amount is projected to reach \$538 billion by 1999 if current trends continue.

A simple commonsense principle has gotten our Nation and the poor into the present fix: You get more of what you pay for. And for the past 30 years we have subsidized and thus promoted self-destructive behavior like illegitimacy and family disintegration.

This explosion in entitlement spending has fueled an entitlement mentality. Millions of Americans live day after day, month after month and year after year on paychecks from the government and give nothing in return—except their assurance that they will stay poor, and continue to fuel the government poverty machine.

What is needed is a dramatic change, a reversal of the trends of the last 30 years.

Today, I intend to re-introduce a welfare reform bill similar to one which I introduced last year with Senator GRASSLEY and Senator BROWN. The bill has three central purposes: to reduce illegitimacy, promote work, and control the growth of welfare costs.

The bill will convert 67 means-tested welfare programs into a single block grant to the States. Spending on this block grant, and several other Federal programs, will be subject to an aggregate cap of 3 percent per year.

This single block grant will give States the flexibility to design programs which meet the specific needs of their poor citizens. If one State has had particular success with the Head Start Program, for example, and the State wanted to double the Head Start budget or triple it, they could do so, as long as the aggregate cap held growth to 3 percent.

Welfare should no longer be a one-way handout which destroys the desire of able-bodied people to work. Real reform would transform welfare into a system of mutual responsibility in which welfare recipients who can work would be required to contribute something back to society in return for assistance given.

My proposal will require able-bodied welfare recipients to work in return for their benefits. By 1997, the second year after enactment, half of all welfare beneficiaries will be required to do

community service or to work in public or private sector jobs in return for their benefits.

This bill would target work requirements first on the most employable welfare recipients: single, able-bodied males, married couples receiving benefits, and single mothers of older children. The last group effected would be the least employable recipients: single mothers of preschool children. This avoids the extremely high cost of child care associated with putting these young mothers to work.

One of the most insidious aspects of the welfare system is its destructive effect on the family. Our welfare system tells a young unwed mother, in effect, that she can collect up to \$15,000 per year in benefits as long as she does not work or marry an employed male. Under such conditions, it makes more sense to remain unmarried. Welfare has transformed the low-income working husband from a necessary breadwinner into a net financial handicap.

When the Great Society antipoverty programs were instituted in 1965, the out-of-wedlock birth rate in the United States was 7 percent. Thirty years later the rate has jumped to 30 percent. At this rate of growth it is projected to reach 50 percent by the year 2015, an alarming prospect by anyone's standards. Fifty percent, Mr. President. That means that, within just 20 years, half of all American children could be born to single women.

Real welfare reform must discourage destructive behavior and encourage constructive behavior. Starting prospectively 1 year after enactment, the bill would eliminate direct welfare subsidies—except medical aid—to unmarried women under age 21 who have children out of wedlock. State governments may use Federal block grant funds to develop alternative strategies for assisting children born out of wedlock. The bill also encourages marriage by providing a tax credit to low-income married couples with children where at least one parent is employed.

We all recognize the need, and share the desire, to reverse the corrupting incentives in our current welfare system. Welfare recipients must work for their benefits, and must not have children that they cannot support. This is the foundation on which real welfare reform rests, and welfare legislation that does not address both of these issues does not represent true reform.

Finally, the Senate will soon take up welfare reform, and we must be willing to make the kinds of tough decisions necessary to reduce illegitimacy and promote work, or we will condemn yet another generation to the crippling effects of welfare dependency. The current state of our welfare system demands that we take immediate action, but we must do so with a clear purpose, in mind.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 835. A bill to provide for the operation of laboratories to carry out cer-

tain public-health functions for the region along the international border with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

#### SOUTHWEST PUBLIC LABORATORY ACT

• Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I introduce legislation that is critically needed along our southern border. The Southwest Public Health Laboratory Act was approved by the Senate last year as part of S. 1569, the Disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Act. Unfortunately, Congress never completed action on S. 1569 and consequently the grave health and environmental risks along the United States-Mexico border continue to spread.

This legislation will allow for the establishment and operation of State health and environmental labs along the United States-Mexico border. The grants made available by this act will support and leverage the important laboratory work our border States are already providing. Currently, all the border States suffer from a critical shortage of environmental and occupational health monitoring. The laboratory services provided by this legislation will support both local and State health and environmental agencies. As population and commerce increases along the border as a result of our commitment to hemispheric free trade, the need for state-of-the-art laboratory capacity will only increase.

We have all seen the media accounts from California to New Mexico to Texas spotlighting the deplorable environmental conditions along the border. Beyond those television reports are millions of border residents, primarily minority, who are subject to health risks incumbent to these conditions.

We are already aware of some of these risks, such as polluted water sources, untreated sewage, and pesticides, but there are others we may not be aware of simply because there are not enough facilities to analyze them.

Let me give you an example of this problem from my home State of Texas. In the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, researchers obtained samples of fish from nearby waterways, a regular staple of many local diets, and it was determined that the edible tissue of the fish contained an unacceptable amount of the highly toxic chemical PCB. After further analysis, the Texas Department of Health promptly issued an advisory strongly recommending that fish taken from the waterways and reservoirs in the area may not be eaten.

Of course, this discovery and analysis was given prompt attention. However, there are many potential risks along the border that are going unchecked. There simply is more work of that nature in the United States-Mexico border area than there are facilities to do it. There is an intolerable potential cost—the health of the citizens in the border area. So Federal support will mean badly needed improvement in the

border States' abilities to respond to the health and environmental risks facing all citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation that is critical to the health of citizens not only along the southern border but also across the United States. The health and environmental problems along the border do not check with customs or immigration before crossing the border. The Southwest Border Health Laboratory is an essential component in battling these risks before they have a chance to spread beyond the border. •

By Mr. EXON:

S. 836. A bill to authorize appropriations for pipeline safety for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### THE PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1995

• Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce by request the administration's proposed pipeline safety bill.

This legislation builds on a continuing record of success that administrations of both parties and the Congress have made in ensuring the safe operation of America's vast network of natural gas, petroleum, water, and other types of pipelines.

Pipeline safety is one of the lesser known, but more important responsibilities of the Senate Commerce Committee. As a former chairman of the Senate Surface Transportation Subcommittee I am proud of the progress we have made in advancing safety. With this legislation, the Congress can open a new chapter of safety.

This legislation gives the Secretary of Transportation authority to make grants to States to encourage the adoption of effective comprehensive one-call legislation. It also authorizes the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements with the private sector to bring new efficiencies to pipeline safety research, risk assessment, and mapping.

In a time of tight budgets, the bill also introduces the concept of risk management to pipeline safety activities. With fewer dollars available the Congress must be certain that we get the most bang for the buck or more appropriately, in the area of energy pipeline safety, we need to get no bang for the buck.

Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over this important legislation, I want to mention some areas of concern which I would like our committee to address. In the area of mapping of pipeline locations, the Congress must assure that public and private funds are not wasted on duplicative efforts. The Government's mapping needs must be better coordinated with the private sector and existing mapping operations within the U.S. Government. There is no need to reinvent the wheel when it comes to pipeline mapping.

I am also concerned about the way pipeline safety user fees are calculated

for natural gas suppliers in rural areas. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] maintains a fee schedule for their activities which more fairly takes into account the risk, volume, and economics of serving rural areas. I have urged the Department of Transportation to consider the FERC schedule and its appropriateness for their operations.

Finally, Mr. President, I am committed to enacting a meaningful comprehensive one-call bill. Last year I was pleased to propose a compromise and work with Senators BRADLEY and LAUTENBERG to enact comprehensive one-call legislation. Meaningful call-before-you-dig programs will save lives, dollars, and productivity. I would certainly support the addition of the Bradley-Exon bill to this legislation. That bill represents the one-call compromise worked out last year.

Mr. President, I look forward to the swift enactment of pipeline safety legislation this year and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis prepared by the Department of Transportation be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 836

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pipeline Safety Act of 1995."

#### SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 49, United States Code.

#### TITLE I—PIPELINE SAFETY AMENDMENTS

##### SEC. 101. RISK MANAGEMENT.

Chapter 601 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### "§ 60126. Risk Management

"(a) The Secretary shall, based on information collected and maintained by the Secretary, conduct an assessment of the risk to public safety and the environment posed by pipeline transportation. The assessment shall—

"(1) rank the risks identified by the Secretary in terms of their probability of occurrence and their likely consequences, and any other factors the Secretary considers relevant;

"(2) identify, in priority order, technically feasible and economically justified actions that should be taken to lessen the risks identified; and

"(3) address, at a minimum, the following subjects:

"(A) Inspection by internal instrumented devices.

"(B) Hydrostatic testing.

"(C) Installation of emergency flow restricting devices, including leak detection systems, for natural gas and hazardous liquid pipelines.

"(D) Inspection and burial of underwater pipelines.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, if the Secretary determines

that rulemaking regarding a subject listed in subsection (a)(3) is not practicable, appropriate, or reasonable, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress, not later than 60 days after the date of such determination, an explanation of the reasons for that determination.

"(c) Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Pipeline Safety Act of 1995, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report including the assessment required under subsection (a) and a plan setting forth the actions proposed by the Secretary to address each risk identified in the assessment. Within 30 days after any substantive change to the action plan, including the addition or deletion of any subject or action in the plan, the Secretary shall inform Congress in writing of the reasons for the change."

##### SEC. 102. ONE CALL NOTIFICATION SYSTEMS.

Section 60114 (relating to one-call notification systems) is amended by striking subsections (b) and (d), and redesignating subsections (c) and (e) as (b) and (d), respectively.

##### SEC. 103. INTERNATIONAL UNIFORMITY.

Section 60117 (relating to administration) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(k) INTERNATIONAL UNIFORMITY OF STANDARDS.—

"(1) PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL FORUMS.—Subject to guidance and direction from the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Transportation may participate in international forums that establish or recommend pipeline safety standards for transporting natural gas and hazardous liquids.

"(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of Transportation may consult with interested authorities to ensure that, to the extent practicable, regulations the Secretary prescribes under this chapter are consistent with standards related to pipeline safety transportation adopted by international authorities.

"(3) DIFFERENCES WITH INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS.—The section does not require the Secretary to prescribe a standard identical to, less stringent than, or more stringent than a standard adopted by an international authority or otherwise limit the Secretary's discretion in issuing standards."

##### SEC. 104. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

Section 60117 (relating to administration), as amended by section 103, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) FUNDING AUTHORITY.—To carry out this chapter, the Secretary may enter into grants, cooperative agreements, and other transactions with any person, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, any unit of State or local government, any educational institution, and any other entity to further the objectives of this chapter, including the development, improvement, and promotion of one-call damage prevention programs, research, risk assessment, and mapping."

##### SEC. 105. ANNUAL REPORTS.

Section 60124 (relating to annual reports) is repealed.

Section 60125 (relating to authorization of appropriations) is amended—

(1) by striking "gas;" and all that follows in subsection (a) and inserting "gas, \$16,450,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999."; and

(2) by striking "liquid;" and all that follows in subsection (b) and inserting "liquid,

\$10,968,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999.";

(3)(A) by striking the heading of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "STATE PIPELINE SAFETY GRANTS.—";

(B) by striking "title;" and all that follows in subsection (c)(1) and inserting "title, \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999.";

(4) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

(d) OTHER TRANSACTIONS.—Not more than the following amounts may be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out section 60117(1) of this title: \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999."; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) SPECIAL PROJECTS.—For each of fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, not more than \$500,000 or 0.5 percent of the amount appropriated annually to carry out chapter 601, whichever is less, may be appropriated to the Secretary to fund special projects undertaken jointly with other offices within the Department to improve the administration of transportation safety programs."

##### SEC. 107. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) Section 60105 is amended by inserting "PIPELINE SAFETY PROGRAM" after "STATE" in the heading.

(b) Section 60106 is amended by inserting "PIPELINE SAFETY" after "STATE" in the heading.

(c) Section 60107 is amended by inserting "PIPELINE SAFETY" after "STATE" in the heading.

(d) Section 60114(a)(9) is amended by striking "60122, and 60123" and inserting "and 60122".

#### TITLE II—AVIATION TARIFF AMENDMENT

##### SEC. 201. AVIATION TARIFF AMENDMENT.

Section 40114(b) (relating to reports and records), is amended—

(1) by striking "The Secretary" in the second sentence and inserting "With the exception of tariffs, the Secretary; and"

(2) by inserting "The Secretary shall ensure that tariff records are available to the public on a permanent basis." after the second sentence.

#### TITLE III—HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AMENDMENTS

##### SEC. 301. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 5107(j)(4)(A) (relating to employee training requirements) is amended by striking "section 5127(c)(3)" and inserting "section 5127(b)(1)".

(b) Section 5116(j)(4)(A) (relating to supplemental training grants) is amended by striking "subsection (g)" and inserting "section 5115".

(c) Section 5110(e) (relating to retention of shipping papers) is amended—

(1) by striking the heading and inserting the following:

"(e) Retention of Shipping Papers.—"; and

(2) by striking the first sentence and inserting "A person required to provide a shipping paper to a carrier and a carrier to which a shipping paper is provided shall retain, at or accessible through its principal place of business, a paper or electronic image copy of each shipping paper for one year from the date the shipping paper has been provided to the carrier."

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

##### TITLE I. PIPELINE SAFETY AMENDMENTS

Sections 101 and 102. These sections contain the short title for title I of the Act, and clarify that references in title I to amendments of sections or other provisions are

considered to be amendments to title 49, United States Code.

Section 103. This section would incorporate in the pipeline safety statute a framework for risk management that would facilitate the introduction of risk-based decision-making into the pipeline safety program. Basing pipeline safety and environmental decisionmaking on risk management principles assures that the safety investments of pipeline operators can be directed to those risks that pose the greatest threat to the public and the environment.

Both the Department and pipeline operators have been working diligently to develop national standards for pipeline system risk assessment (the tool) and risk management (the safety program). In order to accommodate this new approach to safety and environmental decisionmaking, the traditional regulatory program framework, which focuses almost exclusively on regulations to address every risk, would be changed. This proposal has the benefit of facilitating a determination before a rulemaking or other action is begun as to what is the best risk-reduction action. In addition, the proposal supplies the means for determining among identified risks which ones should be addressed in what order and with what resources.

Section 104. This section removes the provision authorizing grants to States for development of one-call systems. The grant authority would be consolidated in 49 U.S.C. 60117(1) (discussed in section 106 of this bill).

Section 105. This section would allow the Secretary to participate in international forums that establish pipeline safety standards for transporting natural gas and hazardous liquids. The Secretary would be authorized to consult with international authorities to ensure that, to the extent practicable, United States regulations are consistent with international standards. The Secretary would not be required to adopt identical standards and would not be prohibited from adopting more, or less, stringent standards.

Section 106. This section provides the Secretary with general authority to enter into grants, cooperative agreements and other transactions with States, industry, non-profit institutions, and other entities to support activities that will achieve the objectives of the statute. These activities include, but are not limited to, one-call notification, research, risk assessment, and mapping.

This section would expand the Secretary's current authority to make grants to state pipeline safety agencies, by allowing the Secretary to make grants to other State agencies, operators of one-call notification systems, and non-profit organizations to actively promote the use of one-call notification systems. Prevention of damage to underground facilities such as pipelines, water and sewer lines, fiber optic cables, and electric lines represents one of the Nation's most important and relevant safety initiatives. Damage to pipelines from excavation and other powered equipment is the leading cause of pipeline failures. The best opportunity to avoid damage to underground facilities is through use of one-call systems whereby excavators can receive information, before they dig, from a single source about all underground facilities at risk from the excavation. However, the effectiveness of state laws and programs and one-call centers themselves varies widely throughout the country, and the need for uniformity is great as many underground facilities, and the excavators that threaten them, operate in many states and localities.

Grants provided for in this provision could be used to establish, modify, improve, and promote the use of one-call systems, including publicizing the risks involved in pipeline transportation and the benefits of one-call systems in addressing those risks.

This authority is central to execution of the Department's pipeline safety risk management program for it will enable the agency to obtain the data it will need continually to determine risks, quantify and rank those risks, adopt strategies and solutions to meet those risks, and identify available and new technologies necessary to keep pace with safety needs. This authority resides in other Federal agencies, and offers excellent opportunities to leverage Federal resources with other entities who have a role to play in risk management and accident prevention.

Section 107. This section would repeal the requirement that the Secretary report annually on pipeline safety activities conducted under 49 U.S.C. chapter 601. The information required in this report, and more, is provided at least annually to Congress during the appropriations process, as well as to the authorizing committees on a periodic basis. In addition, widespread dissemination of pipeline safety data is made to our state partners, and is the subject of an increasing number of requests under the Freedom of Information Act. The time spent to compile the report has resulted in the report being at least two years out of date by the time it is issued. The Department's new data capabilities enable it to provide up-to-date information on an "as requested" basis in response to routine requests for information. This capability meets the needs of our stakeholders, while not requiring the resources to assemble what, under the best of circumstances, is outdated information for the annual report.

Section 108. This section would authorize appropriations for the Department of Transportation to carry out the pipeline safety provisions of 49 U.S.C. 60101 *et seq.* For fiscal year 1996, this section would authorize \$16,450,000 for gas, \$10,968,000 for hazardous liquid, and \$15,000,000 for State grants. This provision also authorizes \$5,000,000 in fiscal year 1996 to fund activities conducted under section 60117(1) (see discussion under Section 106 of the bill), and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999. Finally, for fiscal years 1996 through 1999, this section authorizes not more than \$500,000 or 0.5% of the amount appropriated annually to carry out chapter 601, whichever is less, to fund special projects. This provision is intended to provide a small amount of funding for projects undertaken jointly with other agencies within the Department to improve the administration of transportation safety programs.

Section 109. The first three subsections amend the titles of three sections to clarify their applicability. Subsection (d) corrects one of the requirements for qualified state one-call programs by deleting the reference to state adoption of Federal criminal sanctions. The reference was inadvertently added to the list of requirements when the pipeline safety laws were enacted into positive law in Pub. L. No. 103-272.

#### TITLE II. AVIATION TARIFF AMENDMENT

Section 201. This section would amend section 40114 of title 49, United States Code, which sets out the requirements for maintaining as public records those materials filed with the Department on aviation matters, including voluminous international passenger fare tariff filings. Currently, section 40114 requires the Department to maintain physical custody of tariff filings.

In the spirit of reinventing government, the Department has reexamined the manner in which it performs its tariff custodianship function and found that the costs of the system greatly outweigh the benefits. The Department has concluded that the custodianship requirement, which was first enacted in 1938, has outlived its usefulness to the public, the airline industry, and the Government.

In 1989, the Department instituted a system by which air carriers may file international passenger tariffs electronically as an alternative to filing paper tariffs. To be eligible for the benefits of automated filing, a carrier is required to accept responsibility for maintaining a secure and accessible on-line tariff database. The major air carriers responded to this opportunity by contracting with tariff publishing agents to manage these electronic filing functions. Currently, the agents' on-line databases store over 95 percent of all tariffs. The Department strictly regulates these databases. Filers are required to keep the databases available for public and departmental access at no cost, secure against destruction, alteration, or tampering, and open to inspection by the Department to ensure security and integrity. The amended section would ensure continued public access to historical tariff data contained in the database currently used by the Department.

Although the Department has met its custodianship requirement by mandating a daily tape from the on-line tariff databases, it stores this data in a fashion that allows very limited flexibility in retrieving it. In contrast, the agents' databases are modern, flexible, and freely accessible to Department officials. As a result, the departmental archive serves no purpose except to comply with the statutorily-mandated custodianship requirement. Removing the statutory requirement that copies of the tariffs be preserved in the physical custody of the Department would enable the Department to cease its duplicative archival efforts and realize a savings.

#### TITLE III. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AMENDMENTS

Section 301. This section amends 49 U.S.C. 5107(e) and 5116(j) to correct cross-references. This section also amends 49 U.S.C. 5110(e) to specify that the one-year retention period for a shipping paper begins when the shipping paper is provided to a carrier instead of when transportation is completed, because it would be very difficult for the originator of a shipment to determine when transportation of that shipment has been completed.●

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ROBB):

S. 837. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of James Madison; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### THE JAMES MADISON COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today with my good friend, Senator ROBB, to introduce legislation to establish an endowment to be a permanent source of support for Montpelier, the life-long home of James Madison, the fourth President of the United States and the Father of the U.S. Constitution. President Madison was the third generation of his family to live on this extensive estate located in the lush Piedmont of Virginia. Montpelier was settled by James Madison's grandparents in 1723 and prospered under the ownership of his parents, James (Sr.) and Nelly Conway Madison. In 1794, James Madison, a 43-year-old bachelor, met and fell in love with Dolley Payne Todd, a 26-year-old widow and mother. They were married later the same year.



After the completion of his second Presidential term in 1817, the Madisons retired to Montpelier, where their legendary hospitality kept them in touch with world affairs. At his death in 1836, Madison was buried on the estate. Dollie Madison later returned to Washington where she died in 1849.

Following Madison's death, the contents of the house were auctioned off. Montpelier then changed hands six times, until it was purchased in 1900 by William and Anna Rogers duPont. The National Trust for Historic Preservation received the property in 1983, and opened it for public tours in 1987 as part of the celebration of the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. Today, under the stewardship of the National Trust, Montpelier is beginning a long-term research and preservation process. Unfurnished and as yet unrestored, Montpelier is the focus of a major archaeological and architectural research effort.

The legislation which I am introducing today would authorize the U.S. Mint to produce a commemorative coin to honor the 250th birthday of James Madison. After recovery of minting and production costs, the proceeds from the sale of the James Madison Commemorative Coin, conservatively estimated at \$5 to \$10 million, will be used as the core of a capital campaign to establish an endowment and preserve Montpelier. This campaign will assure the full preservation and restoration of Montpelier and the development of all of the related programmatic activities.

Mr. President, an intensive effort must be mounted to achieve the goal of securing the future of Montpelier. I am committed to making my colleagues in the House and Senate aware of the benefits to be derived from the minting of a coin to honor James Madison, and I am confident that this support can be secured. Our national legislature, indeed, our Nation, owes a great debt to the vision of James Madison. Throughout his life, Montpelier helped shape Madison's character and values. This legislation is an important step toward bringing all Americans closer to this great man.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 240

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 240, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a filing deadline and to provide certain safeguards to ensure that the interests of investors are well protected under the implied private action provisions of the act.

S. 245

At the request of Mr. COHEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 245, a bill to provide for enhanced penalties for health care fraud, and for other purposes.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the period of eligibility for inpatient care for veterans exposed to toxic substances, radiation, or environmental hazards, to extend the period of eligibility for outpatient care for veterans exposed to such substances or hazards during service in the Persian Gulf, and to expand the eligibility of veterans exposed to toxic substances or radiation for outpatient care.

S. 388

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to eliminate the penalties for noncompliance by States with a program requiring the use of motorcycle helmets, and for other purposes.

S. 456

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 456, a bill to improve and strengthen the child support collection system, and for other purposes.

S. 560

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 560, a bill to amend section 6901 of title 31, United States Code, to entitle units of general local government to payments in lieu of taxes for nontaxable Indian land.

S. 628

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers.

S. 647

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 647, a bill to amend section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 to require phasing in of certain amendments of or revisions to land and resource management plans, and for other purposes.

S. 694

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 694, a bill to prevent and punish crimes of sexual and domestic violence, to strengthen the rights of crime victims, and for other purposes.

S. 738

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 738, a bill to amend the Helium Act to prohibit the Bureau of Mines from refining helium and selling refined helium, to dispose of the U.S. helium reserve, and for other purposes.

S. 758

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes.

S. 771

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 771, a bill to provide that certain Federal property shall be made available to States for State use before being made available to other entities, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 31

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 31, A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant Congress and the States the power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

#### THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

#### ROCKEFELLER (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1112

Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mrs. BOXER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002; as follows:

On page 74, strike lines 12 through 24 and insert the following: "budget, the spending aggregates shall be revised and other appropriate budgetary allocations, aggregates, and levels shall be revised to reflect up to 59 percent of the additional deficit reduction achieved as calculated under subsection (c) in budget authority and outlays for legislation that reduces the adverse effects on medicare and medicaid of—

"(1) increased premiums;  
"(2) increased deductibles;  
"(3) increased copayments;  
"(4) limits on the freedom to select the doctor of one's choice;

"(5) reduced quality of health care services caused by funding reductions for health care providers;

"(6) reduced or eliminated benefits caused by restrictions on eligibility or services; or  
"(7) closure of hospitals or nursing homes, or other harms to health care providers.

"(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, budgetary aggregates, and levels under this resolution, revised by an amount that does not exceed 59